



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,400	07/19/2001	Wesley M. Mays	B-70985	9906
32914	7590	05/31/2005	EXAMINER	
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION 3000 THANKSGIVING TOWER 1601 ELM ST DALLAS, TX 75201-4761			ABEBE, DANIEL DEMELASH	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2655		
DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Httt

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/909,400	MAYS, WESLEY M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel D Abebe	2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/22/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinzon (6,161,005) and in view of Mattes et al. (6,380,842)

As to claim 1, Pinzon teaches a door operating system (Fig.1) for moving a latch (3) between open and closed position, including:

An operator mechanism (2) coupled to door latch (3);

A base controller (4) coupled to the operator mechanism for moving the door;

Remote controller (12) adapted for transmitting IR or RF code signals to the base controller receiver (7).

Pinzon teaches where the operator system arrangement includes speech recognition and where codes are transmitted from the remote controller to the controller. Pinzon, however, appears to let the user use his fingers by pushing the corresponding keypads on the remote controller and doesn't explicitly teach where speech recognition is located within the remote controller. However, remote controllers having speech activated-recognition system are notoriously common and well known in the art. Mattes, for example, teaches a door operating system for opening and closing a door, comprising an electronic key (remote controller (2)) for remotely controlling the door operating system wherein the remote controller includes speech recognition for generating the operating signals from a voice command (Col.8, lines 10-23; Fig.3, 42). Therefore, one skilled in the art would appreciate the advantage of modifying the remote controller in Pinzon's art, especially in view of Mattes, for the purpose of allowing the user to speak the commands instead of manually pressing the keypads.

With respect to claims 2-7, Pinzon teaches where the remote controller (Fig.5, 61) having a circuit connected to the keypads includes RF transmitter (Fig.2, 33) for connecting with the base controller (28) by transmitting the codes to operate the doors and also where the remote controller could be hardwired to the base controller(Fig.2a, 22).

And Mattes teaches where the remote controller includes an RF and IR transmitter having its circuit connected to a micro-controller (21) and the speech recognition module (42) and keypads (14-16) (Col.5, line 18; Fig.3).

As to claim 8, Mattes teaches where the remote controller includes a microphone (43) for receiving voice commands including commands to open and close the doors and operating other adjacent functions (Col.51-60).

As to claim 9, Pinzon teaches where the door opening and closing system includes garage door (Fig.5, 71).

As to claim 10, Official Notice is taken that speech recognition having speaker dependent mode is well known and would be obvious to include in Pinzon and Mattes art for security purpose.

As to claims 12-13, Pinzon teaches where the remote controller (61) includes keypads for opening and closing garage door (71).

Claims 14-21 are analogous to claims 1-13 and are rejected for the foregoing reason by Pinzon in view of Mattes.

...Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 99999 as applied to claims 1-10, 12-18 and 20-21 above, and further in view of Bush et al. (6,397,186).

With respect to claims 11 and 19, continuously listening voice command is not explicitly taught by Pinzon and Mattes. However, Bush teaches a remote controller comprising voice recognition module where the voice recognition module includes detection means for continuously listening for voice commands (Fig.5). it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature in the remote controller for allowing the user to speak the commands at any moment.

Art Unit: 2655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D Abebe whose telephone number is 703-308-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Abebe Primary Examiner A.U. 2655



May 24, 2005